

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated June 19, 2006.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-20 have been provisionally rejected over similarly numbered claims in co-pending application no. 10/783,300. That co-pending application may be abandoned, but applicant prefers to avoid doing so pending resolution of the patentability of claim 30 in the instant application.

Specifically, claim 30 is stated to be unpatentable over Farash (US 2003/0151980), in view of Kamiyama (5,339,293).

Claim 30 specifically states that the dial face is such that it has as circumferential boundary which is “oval shaped, defining a long axis and a short axis extending perpendicularly to the long axis”.

Claim 30 further recites that there are provided “a first stem arrangement comprising a plurality of stems coupled to and controlling the first time movement and a second stem arrangement comprising a plurality of stems coupled to and controlling the second time movement” (emphasis added).

Claim 30 further provides that “the first stem arrangement is located to a left side of the first time movement and the second stem arrangement is located to the right of the second time movement”. In other words, one plurality of stems is on the right. The other set is on the left.

Claim 30 also provides “a watch band aligned with the short axis.”

Neither of the two references cited by the Examiner has any of the four features mentioned above. The claimed features are being dismissed in the Office Action out of hand, as though not being important.

The Office Action has relied on Fig. 4 of the primary Farash reference. The shape of the dial in Farash is neither oval, nor does it have a long axis and a minor axis. To the contrary, the width and the height of the watch dial are equal at their widest separation, approximately three centimeters each. Furthermore, it is meaningless to say that the Farash watch dial has a band which is aligned with “the short axis”. This prior art does not have a short axis.

An oval shape as defined in claim 30 is uniquely suited for placing two large-size movements, which are displaced along the hand extension alongside one another. In Farash, the

width and the height are of the same size, and the movements have to be small to accommodate this condition. Respectfully, the Office Action should not dismiss features which the applicant and the marketplace deem to be important, as being trivial.

Insofar as the stem arrangements are concerned, the claim explicitly calls for a plurality of stems on the right side and a plurality of stems on the left side. The plurality of stems on the right side control one movement and the plurality of stems on the other side controls the other movement. In applicant's prior Response, the Kamiyama reference was specifically analyzed and it was pointed out that column 6, lines 10-30 of that reference describe that each of push buttons 9, 10 and 11 controls the settings of a respective one of three time movements. Thus, each button is used for a different one of the time movements. Therefore, the time movement 4 has only one button associated therewith and the time movement 6 has a different single button associated therewith, and so on, which is contrary to the language of claim 30. Nor are the time movements in these secondary Kamiyama reference spaced along the long axis of an oval shaped dial face.

The instant Office Action, which has been made Final, states at paragraph 4 that: "Kamiyama, et. al. suggests several setting buttons 8-11 for separately controlling various timepiece functions in a watch with plural movements." If this statement is intended to say that each time movement has a plurality of stems to control its movement, then applicant respectfully requests specific citations to the text, by identifying the column and the specific lines where there is such a disclosure. Applicant believes that there is no such disclosure in the cited prior art.

As noted above, specific claim limitations have not been addressed in the Final Rejection. Thus, the prior art does not show an oval watch with a long axis and a short axis. The prior art does not show an oval shape. The prior art does not show a band aligned with the short axis of the oval dial face. The prior art does not show a plurality of stems located on one side of the oval watch (in other words, on one side of the short axis and another set of stems located to the other side of the short axis) and dedicated for controlling the second time movement.

For these reasons, the Office Action has not set out a prima facie case of obviousness of the applicant's invention.

In order to avoid incurring additional extension fees, the applicant is submitting herewith a Notice of Appeal, which will be rendered moot if the patentability of claim 30 is confirmed.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and render a decision that claim 30 is directed to patentable subject matter.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700